

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicants have responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

**Applicants' Summary of Interview**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy and opportunity to conduct the telephone interview on December 10, 2008. In the telephone interview, a proposed amendment was discussed, but no agreement was reached.

**Amendments**

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 8, 13, and 18. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification at, for example, p. 13, lines 18-22; p. 15, lines 23-28; and p. 15, line 32 – p. 16, line 5.

**Section 102 Rejection**

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,249,801 issued to Zisapel et al. ("*Zisapel*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Zisapel* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest elements specifically recited in Applicants' claims. For example, *Zisapel* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the following recited in independent Claim 1:

assign the packet to a selected one of a plurality of gateways based on an Internet Protocol (IP) address of the end user, the selected gateway configured to utilize the IP address to provide an accounting service to the end user.

*Zisapel* discloses load balancers connected to servers:

Server farms 10 and 12 typically comprise a load balancer 16 and 18 respectively, which may be a dedicated load balancer or a server or router configured to operate as a load balancer, with each of the load balancers being connected to one or more servers 20.

(*Zisapel*, col. 5 11, lines 15-19.) *Zisapel*, however, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the above elements.

For at least these reasons, independent Claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. For analogous reasons, independent Claims 8, 13, and 18 and their respective dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye  
Reg. No. 45,460

**Correspondence Address:**

Baker Botts L.L.P.  
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600  
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980  
(214) 953-6494  
Date: December 2, 2008

**Customer Number: 05073**